

## *Sample of Search Narrative*

***Position Title***

***Search #XXXXX***

***Date***

### **Search Committee Members**

List search committee members and any changes to the composition of the search committee.

### **Recruitment Sources and Posting Date**

Required sources:

The News Gazette (xx/xx/xx)

U of I Employment Center (xx/xx/xx)

ACJob Listserv (xx/xx/xx)

Other sources and posting date:

### **Selection Process/Criteria**

Provide a summary of how applicant information was reviewed and candidates/finalists were selected for interview.

1. Address screening procedures
2. Address minimum qualifications
3. Address preferred qualifications
4. Address other qualifications
5. Address if a rating scale was used and summarize the role of the rating scale.

### **Interview Narrative**

Provide a brief summary of each candidate interview, including the interview date.

Explain the qualities/characteristics that distinguish the proposed appointee from other finalists.

If designated class members (minorities and women) were finalists and not selected, please specifically address.

### **Offer Approval**

Provide date of email approval from AA Officer or EEO Officer for a verbal offer.

## Sample Narrative

### *Position Title*

*Search #XXXXXX*

*Date*

### Search Committee

**John Doe, Department, Title (Chair)**

**Jane Smith, Department, Title**

**Paul Piper, Department, Title**

**Mary Lamb, Department, Title**

### Approval Process

**1/05/2007** – Approval was received from the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access

### Advertising

The News Gazette (posted 01/13/2007 and 01/20/2007)

The Bloomington Pantagraph (01/13/2007)

ACJob listserv (posted 01/10/2007)

U of I Employment Center (posted 1/8/07)

Department Public Web Site (posted 01/10/2007)

Educause (posted 1/8/07)

IMDiversity.com (posted 1/8/07)

### Selection Process

**01/09/2007** – Met with the Search Committee to review/discuss selection process. Unit Executive Officer met with the search committee to explain the charge of committee. Unit Executive Officer indicated that the committee was to recommend 2-3 candidates to Unit Executive Officer for consideration along with a list of strengths and weaknesses of each candidate. Unit Executive Officer would then select the candidate that was the best fit for the position.

**02/05/2007** – Closing date for the job search.

**02/16/2007** – Met with the Search Committee and reviewed applicants. In the meeting, it was decided which applicants would continue in the interview process and those which did not have the best qualifications to proceed.

External applicants who were chosen as qualified to proceed were phoned to ensure the salary range of the position met their salary requirements. Two applicants removed their names from the list because the salary range did not meet their expectations. The search committee proceeded with a one-hour in-person interview for the remaining six candidates which were conducted between March 8 and 14 (three external and three internal candidates).

**03/14/2007** – Follow-up meeting held with the Search Committee to review the first round in-person interviews with the six candidates. The qualifications of the six candidates were very good but there were two candidates who met the qualifications, visions, goals, and experience of the position the best. They were:

1. Candidate #1
2. Candidate #2

The search committee documented a list of pro's and con's, and strengths and weaknesses of each of the two candidates for future reference.

### ***Second Round in-person interview process:***

A second round in-person interview was scheduled for the final two candidates to help assess their qualifications, visions, goals, and experience. Each candidate met with the search committee again as well as with selected staff (designate).

#### **04/04/2007 – Second Round Interview Summaries:**

1. **Candidate #1.** Candidate #1 has been employed by the University for over twenty years in a number of different jobs. This knowledge of the university, working with a number of university personnel throughout candidate #1's career and being a current employee made candidate #1 a good candidate for this position. Candidate #1 impressed the search committee and others staff who participated in the interview process. Concerns that were highlighted during the second round of interviews included: 1) limited experience managing staff, 2) limited (or inconsistent) success leading existing projects (delayed deliverables and missed deadlines), 3) difficulty leading groups and cultivating productive communications. The leadership and management responsibilities of this position were thought to be stretch based on candidate #1's current performance.
2. **Candidate #2.** Candidate #2 is external to the university but has many experiences with managing professional staff, mentoring and coaching new and existing personnel, providing project management vision to their employer, and leading many high profile projects to successful completion. Candidate #2 has been promoted several times during their career to positions with increasing responsibility and has reported to and worked directly with varying level of stakeholders. Candidate #2 has worked with companies that had no procedures and helped create them, to companies that have very structured project procedures and has helped improve them. Although everyone acknowledged that Candidate #2 would require some short-term mentoring to become familiar with department and the University, there was strong confidence in their management, management, and leadership skills.

#### **Recommendation:**

The search committee submitted a report to the Unit Executive Office that included all the comments from search committee as well as staff that interviewed the candidates. The Unit Executive Officer has recommended we offer the position to Candidate #2 pending approval.